



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 28 July and 10 September 2026

Site visit made on 10 September 2026

by Grahame J. Kean B.A. (Hons) Solicitor, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/R5510/C/26/3378454

Land at St Leonards Farm, New Years Green Lane, Harefield, UB9 6LX

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by D Hughes Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice was issued on 19 March 2026.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: without planning permission, the material change of use of the land at St Leonards Farm, New Years Green Lane, Harefield for use as parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles and associated development, including the formation of a hard surfaced area and the erection of a workshop with vehicle inspection pit.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 - (i) Cease the use of the Land for use of parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles.
 - (ii) Remove from the Land the hard surfacing and hardcore materials associated with the unauthorised use of the Land for use as parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles, as shown in the approximate position shaded in GREEN on the Plan attached to the Notice.
 - (iii) Remove from the Land the workshop structure and fill in the vehicle inspection pit associated with the unauthorised use of the Land for use as parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles, as shown in the approximate position cross-hatched in BLUE on the Plan attached to the Notice.
 - (iv) Remove from the Land all structures and storage containers associated with the unauthorised use of the Land for use as parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles.
 - (v) Remove from the Land all tyres, vehicles parts, equipment and machinery associated with the unauthorised use of the Land for use as parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles.
 - (vi) Remove from the Land all debris, waste, building materials, plant equipment and machinery resulting from compliance with points (i) - (v) above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: six calendar months after this notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f), (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Appeal B Ref: 6008193

Land at St Leonards Farm, New Years Green Lane, Harefield, UB9 6LX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by D Hughes Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19637/APP/2025/191, dated 28 January 2025, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2025.
 - The development proposed is: formation of hard surfaced area for the parking of up to 25 HGV's.
-

Formal Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of

the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the use as parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles and associated development, including the formation of a hard surfaced area and the erection of a workshop with vehicle inspection pit at Land at St Leonards Farm, New Years Green Lane, Harefield, UB9 6LX as shown on the plan attached to the notice and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Appeal B

2. No further action is taken.

Procedural matter

3. The deemed planning application (DPA) as result of the s174 appeal partially overlaps with the s78 appeal. The latter seeks permission for a hard surfaced area to park up to 25 HGV's and the DPA seeks the formation of a hard surfaced area but for the same purpose. The enforcement notice was not "pre-existing" such that the Council could have exercised a power in s70C of the 1990 Act to decline to determine the planning application. Conversely, an appeal on ground (a) might have been barred if the notice were issued after the related application was made, however that application has self-evidently not ceased to be under consideration.
4. Even so, the related application concerns less development than the notice encompasses and, bearing in mind the decision to quash the enforcement notice and grant planning permission on the DPA, it would in my view be unnecessarily confusing to duplicate the conditions or strive to make the two sets of conditions consistent with one another where the developments do not fully coincide. Therefore, I have decided to take no further action on Appeal B.

Preliminary Matters

Retrospective nature of application and biodiversity

5. Although not repeated in the banner heading, the description of development in the application indicates that the planning application was made retrospectively. The Council does not pursue its objection based on biodiversity net gain.

Updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6. This was published on 17 August 2026. The parties were invited to comment as to whether the NPPF and its national decision-making policies (NDMP) have relevance to their cases. I have considered the comments received.

Ground (a) on Appeal A

Main issues

- whether the development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt;
- the effect of the development on the highway network and whether any harm can be suitably mitigated;
- whether the benefits of the development would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, assessed against the NDMPs of the NPPF; and
- whether other considerations indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan.

Background

7. The 0.46 ha appeal site is in the Green Belt to the north of Newyears Green Lane. It is used for parking, storage and repair of commercial vehicles and associated development. A hard surface area extends across the site. There is a workshop and vehicle inspection pit. Vegetation is on the south and east boundaries. The site is adjacent to a haulage operator and skip hire operation to the west, and an aggregate operation on its north boundary in the St Leonards Farm cluster of uses. The nearest residential property is some c25m away which it is undisputed would not be adversely affected. An adjacent site to the east has planning permission for the retention and extension of hardstanding approved in 2024.
8. Newyears Green is a rural unclassified road lacking road markings, street lighting, and footways. West of the appeal site, the road is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass. I drove up and down the road past the appeal site several times. The conditions are not ideal for two-way traffic but there are several passing places that are usable. The site is not generally open to the public.
9. The site has a PTAL ranking of zero, indicating that there are no public transport services serving the site and, with no safe or convenient walking or cycling routes the Council found it to be an unsustainable location that would encourage travel by private motor vehicle. The HGV drivers come to the site in their cars, park there, take the lorries out, return them and drive away in their cars after their daily work.

Policy background

10. By s38(6) of Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 any determination under the Planning Acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework 2026 (NPPF) asserts that it is a material consideration of critical importance and states in Annex A that its national decision making policies (NDMP) are “*material considerations which must be taken into account in decision-making from the day of its publication*” despite the Government’s decision not to put the NPPF on a statutory basis.
11. Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan 2012 (LP) seeks to apply national and London Plan policies for the Green Belt, however such policies (or parts of them) which are materially inconsistent with NDMPs should be given very limited weight, which is the case for example with NDMP GB7(1)(g) discussed below.
12. Development proposals in the Green Belt are considered through applying NDMP GB6 and NDMP GB7. NDMP S5(5) states that where development would not be inappropriate, proposals should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the NDMPs but applying NDMP 5(2) - ie advising it is unlikely that would be the case unless the NDMPs in question state in terms that permission should be refused.
13. The relevant part of NDMP GB7(1)(g) advises that development is not inappropriate in the Green Belt where it would use grey belt land and not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. Grey belt land is land in the Green Belt that is previously developed land (PDL) and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in policy GB2. It is common ground that the appeal site meets this definition.

14. The Council disputes whether the additional requirements are met, namely that there should be an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed and it should be in a sustainable location with particular reference to NDMP TR3.

Whether sustainable location

15. DMP Policy DMT 7(A)(i) requires development with high numbers of transport movements such as those relating to logistics and distribution or freight to show that they are suitably located to enable direct routing to the strategic road network.
16. The above policy is broadly consistent with NDMP TR3 (1)(a) which requires development generating a significant amount of movement, which would be so for the site's use for up to 25 HGVs, *"in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable"*, limiting the need to travel by car *"unless the nature of the development would make this impractical."*
17. NDMP E4 (2) recognises that development for business needs in rural areas may need to be located in places not well served by public transport provided it uses previously developed land, physically well-related to existing development, and its siting and design is consistent with the character of its surroundings.
18. The appellant is a local haulage operator. The appeal site is physically surrounded by a variety of established existing vehicle dependent commercial uses. The site and adjacent uses are industrial in character, but the site does not conflict with sensitive receptors. Its accessibility and links to the strategic road network are said to be poor. This assessment seems to be influenced by conditions on Newyears Green Lane itself but there are benefits in being in relatively close proximity to the M25, M40 and A40 strategic road network, with access to key freight corridors.
19. The 25 HGVs carry bulky items needed by local construction activity. They leave the appeal site early in the morning and are out all day generating traffic movements not possible by alternative modes of travel. The appellant's existing customer base is within 30-minutes' drive time with access to a wider catchment of businesses and population, 1–2 hours drive away. Such locational attributes are relevant to the operation of open storage uses such as HGV-based businesses, where proximity to strategic transport infrastructure and a customer base are key drivers of demand. Whilst most employees would use cars, it is said that there are 29 staff members and 9 alleged minibus users which if so, would go some way to mitigate this harm. A travel plan could be applied to the site to minimise low levels of single occupancy private car use.
20. The site, being well-related to an established industrial cluster is operationally well suited for open storage uses. Despite its shortcomings in terms of lack of public transport accessibility, I find that it is in a sustainable location in terms of DMP Policy DMT 7(A)(i), NDMP TR3 and NDMP E4.

Unmet need for type of development proposed

21. NDMP E3 supports freight and logistics uses where: good access to transport networks exists appropriate to the type of development; environmental impacts are limited taking into account proposed mitigation and sufficient and secure parking exists for lorries and vehicles in accordance with policy TR4(1)(e). This latter policy encourages suitable parking spaces to reflect the location and nature of the

development, standards in the development plan, and adequate provision to allow charging of electric vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

22. As to whether an unmet need exists, NDMP E2(2) requires consideration to be given to whether *“market signals indicate an undersupply of specific types of business land or premises, taking into account the anticipated catchment area for the type of development proposed, the changing needs of different sectors and the availability of suitable existing land and buildings”*.
23. The submitted need and alternative sites assessment (needs assessment)¹ analyses the industrial and logistics (I/L) sector and open storage markets at a London-wide and local level. The I/L sector comprises the light industrial (formerly B1c) use class, now part of Class E, general industry (B2 use class) and storage and distribution (B8 use class). Open storage is treated as a sub-set of the I/L sector, typically the B8 use class. The I/L sector also includes warehouses and factories and associated yard spaces.
24. In applying the NDMP policies to these appeals I find that the type of development to be considered is an open storage use where limiting environmental and amenity impacts will be relevant and sustainable transport accessibility is not always possible. NDMP E3 gives specific support for freight and logistics uses and associated infrastructure, the glossary definition including HGV operating centres. Nighttime operations are not necessarily typical for this type of development. I note they are not critical to the proposals, although early morning HGV activity can create noise and disturbance so locating a development of this type in a place physically well connected to a settlement is not always possible.
25. The capacity study calculates employment land supply in broader categories than would be reasonable to posit in terms of assessing the “type” of development to be considered. Therefore, I disagree that the B8 use class only is to be considered: previously there may have been no national or local policy requirement to consider smaller subsets within each use class but the NPPF provides the practical criteria to assess the more relevant type of development for which there may be an unmet need. Measuring availability solely by the amount of vacant space might not always give as accurate a picture of supply constraints, which is why analysing an equilibrium rate can be useful to compare with actual vacancy rates.
26. A key finding of the needs assessment is that the I/L market in Hillingdon and Greater London is supply constrained with available land consistently below the 8% equilibrium level commonly used in assessing market needs. It has averaged approximately 7.4% in LB Hillingdon and the Greater London market averaged 5.7%. Effectively this results in limited options for I/LL occupiers and by extension open storage occupiers². It criticises the Council’s submitted employment land capacity study³ in that on overall need, it fails to quantify the specific needs of the open storage sector. I agree that this is a drawback of the use of the study.
27. The former depot was in another London borough’s area but I see nothing wrong in the appellant focussing on the search for suitable sites in the Council’s area, which of course is where the deemed application for the continued use arises, or in

¹ Statement on Open Storage Need and Alternative Sites Assessment, June 2026

² Referring back to the March 2026 assessment at paragraph 5.2.5.

³ LB Hillingdon Employment Land and Capacity Study, December 2023

confining the search to existing open storage sites rather than I/L or B8 sites in general. The unauthorised nature of the development is discussed separately.

28. The capacity study acknowledges the role the wider site at St Leonards Farm has in meeting need, recommending that it: *“should remain an employment site due to the fact that it remains well utilised, occupied, and is a much-needed industrial location for the activities currently present”*⁴. The other site within the North Hillingdon cluster, Salamander Quays is unsuitable for frequent HGVs or yard-based activities⁵.
29. The opportunity to reduce vehicular traffic is limited by the nature of the business which requires open storage land where environmental and amenity impacts can be limited. However, it is undisputed that almost all existing open storage sites within Hillingdon are fully occupied⁶. Proximity to residential uses, and operational and layout limitations are among the drawbacks cited by the appellant to the Glebe Farm site as an alternative. Whether or not such imitations can be justified, it is not suggested that the supply constraints identified could be absorbed on this single site. The test is not to see whether an alternative site could meet the demand “presented by one singular business” as the Council suggests. If there is an alternative site as suggested, but contested by the appellant, the appeal site still deserves to be assessed on its own merits in accordance with policy.
30. I am persuaded by the appellant's evidence in this appeal, of low vacancy rates below equilibrium levels, rental growth significantly exceeding inflation, and the ongoing loss of industrial and open storage land to competing uses, that there is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed.

Conclusion as to inappropriate development

31. Very limited weight is given to the development plan Green Belt policies, Policies EM2, DME1 4 and London Plan G2. The development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan and would for the above reasons not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, pursuant to NDMP GB7 (1) the development should not be regarded as harmful to the Green Belt or be required to demonstrate very special circumstances.

Highway safety

32. Policies T1, T2 and T4 of the London Plan 2021 seeks a modal shift to public transport, safe and accessible streets, and to avoid unacceptable traffic or transport impacts, with residual impacts appropriately mitigated. DMP Policies DMT1 and DMT2 generally seek developments that are acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and general highway safety.
33. DMP Policy DMT 2 also requires development to ensure safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network to the Council's standards, suitably mitigating any traffic impacts in terms of capacity and functions of existing and committed roads, including on roads or through junctions at capacity. DMP Policy DMT 2(A)(ii) seeks to prevent any deleterious impact on the highway network.

⁴ Paragraph 5.6.2.

⁵ Ibid paragraph 7.23

⁶ Needs assessment, paragraph 4.2.3 and Council's final comments, paragraph 1.21.

34. These policies appear broadly consistent with the NPPF policies on transport. NDMP TR6: Assessing transport impacts, states at TR6.4 that development should be refused if there is a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety, taking into account mitigation proposed including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement.
35. The site has a size, dimensions and manoeuvring area sufficient for articulated vehicles to turn without reversing onto the highway and provides secure, gated, hard-surfaced parking for the HGVs, employees' cars and the works minibus.
36. To satisfactorily mitigate the danger to users of the highway network it would be necessary to ensure, through measures to be implemented as part of an approved scheme or schemes, works in the highway to improve visibility splays and to ensure that vehicles larger than a light goods vehicle do not access or egress Newyears Green Lane to the west of the site.
37. Other conditions attached to a permission could suitably limit parking and storage, restrict numbers of HGVs on site and hours of operation, and put in place parking and management operation plans together with a green travel plan to promote minibus use and electric charging of vehicles used on site.
38. The appellant refers to the "sheer number of current valid" licences for HGV operators at St Leonards Farm served by the same single access.⁷ I have a significant residual concern about the potential cumulative effects on the highway network going forward, if permission were to be granted for the desired use.
39. The appeal site is said to be the only remaining available parcel of open land within this wider commercial cluster and intensification and/or redevelopment potential is limited in this cluster. However, future uses, degrees of intensification, highway conditions along Newyears Green Lane and so forth obviously cannot be effectively controlled through any permission granted herein. St Leonards Farm is referred to in the capacity study as fit-for-purpose and suitable in its current state for continued employment use but not for future development.⁸
40. The appellant is willing to accept a temporary and personal permission to allow the acceptability of the use to be reviewed at the end of the period. I see no need for a personal permission, however a time limited permission would be appropriate. The suggested period of 5 or 10 years would present an unacceptable risk of conditions deteriorating without the possibility of effective remedial action. Therefore, in the circumstances a time limited permission of 3 years would in my planning judgement strike the right balance, allowing the business to operate without undue restrictions but retaining oversight of longer term effects, including cumulative effects on capacity and congestion in the local highway network.
41. Taking account of these measures and subject to suitable wording of the conditions I intend to impose, the development would reduce the traffic impacts to a satisfactory degree, satisfying the requirements of the above cited policies, including Policies DMT 2(A)(ii) and NDMP TR6 whilst ensuring no severe adverse impacts on the transport network or unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

Intentional unauthorised development

⁷ Appeal statement, paragraph 11.

⁸ Employment Land and Capacity Study, paragraph 5.60

42. The date of the associated licence application was 2017 which demonstrated a clear intention to move to the appeal site some time ago. The appellant was served with a temporary stop notice in January 2025 during his development of the site to facilitate the use, and yet the unauthorised use has continued. I find on the information provided that there has been intentional unauthorised development.
43. NDMP DM8 states that in cases of unauthorised development where consideration is being given whether to grant permission in respect of a breach of planning control, if it is found that the unauthorised development was intentional, substantial weight should be accorded against the grant of planning permission.

Other considerations

44. NDMP E2 states that in meeting the need for business land and premises and to support business growth, substantial weight should be given to the economic benefits of proposals for commercial development that would effectively promote its viability. There are benefits accruing to the continued operation of the site, chief among which are the economic benefits derived from the business and the maintenance of several jobs of the HGV drivers and of the administrative staff. The wider service provided by the business to the construction sector is also of demonstrable benefit to the local economy.
45. As the appeal site is enclosed to the west by commercial uses, to the south by an established tree and hedge line and from the east by landscaped bunding, subject to a landscaping condition the retention of the hardstanding and parked vehicles would not unduly affect the visual amenity of the area. The inspection pit and workshop, if used solely for repair and maintenance of the HGV's operated from the site should be viewed as works ancillary to the use, generating no additional traffic movements. The structure is screened from the main road and given the physical and landscape context the character and appearance of the site and surroundings is not unacceptably harmed. That said, as a temporary structure its form and disposition within the site should be conditioned as part of an approved scheme for the overall layout of the development.
46. The development would therefore comply with LP Policies BE1 in maintaining the quality of the built environment, DMP Policy DMHB 11 in achieving acceptable design standards, and DMP Policy 12 by integrating with the surrounding area.

Planning balance

47. The development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore should not be regarded as harmful to the Green Belt or be required to demonstrate very special circumstances.
48. The unauthorised development was intentional and that fact is given substantial weight against the grant of any permission. There are some adverse highways impacts that require to be mitigated but subject to suitable conditions, including a time limited condition to ensure a timely review of those impacts, the development would comply with DMP Policy DMT 2(A)(ii) and NDMP TR6.
49. The Government's objective as set out in the NPPF is to support sustainable economic growth. The economic benefits of the scheme attract considerable weight, give also the lack of readily available alternative sites for the expressed needs of the operation. When assessed against the NDMPs and applying NDMP

S5 (2), I find that the benefits of the development would not be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects.

50. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The key development plan policies for determining this appeal are those I have referred to above in my decision save that the development plan's Green Belt policies carry very limited weight. Otherwise, the development, subject to appropriate conditions would comply with the development plan as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the intentional unauthorised nature of the development that indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I shall grant permission.

Conditions

51. To provide a review mechanism for the longer-term effects of the development on the highway network a time limited condition is necessary as described above. Further, it is important to make every effort to reduce the impact on the landscape. Parking for the HGVs should be rationalised and improved to provide larger areas of boundary planting, limiting the hardscape. This should be made the subject of a retrospective condition incorporating a scheme to be approved in default of which the use must cease and all vehicles, structures, equipment etc should be permanently removed from the site. Such a condition should incorporate other important requirements, namely the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site, external lighting and improved visibility splays at the junction with New Years Lane in the interests of sustainable drainage, minimising flood risk, highway safety and visual amenity.
52. I make it abundantly clear to the appellant that the timely submission, approval and implementation of all elements of the scheme is vital to make the development acceptable in planning terms, and that the consequences of non-compliance may be serious in that the grant of permission is not lost but its benefit would be if enforcement action is taken against any breach of the condition.
53. To satisfactorily mitigate the danger to users of the highway network it would be necessary to condition the permission to prevent vehicles larger than a light goods vehicle accessing or egressing Newyears Green Lane to the west of the site.
54. Other conditions are needed to limit parking and storage, restrict numbers of HGVs on site and the hours of operation, and secure parking and management operation plans for the reasons given below. I have considered the suggested hours of operation given by the parties and have adjusted the Council's version to enable a slightly earlier weekday start and later finish only. A travel plan is necessary to minimise the unbridled use of the private car to and from the site. This should include evidence of the minibus route, parking and other logistics including demonstration of incentives for the staff to use the minibus and to promote electric charging of vehicles used on site.

Conclusion on Appeal A

55. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal succeeds on ground (a). I shall grant planning permission for the development as described in the notice. The enforcement notice will be quashed.

56. In these circumstances the appeal on grounds (f) and (g) does not fall to be considered.

Conclusion on Appeal B

57. For the reasons given above no further action will be taken in connection with this appeal.

Grahame J. Kean

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

APPELLANT

Michael Rudd	Barrister, Kings Chambers
Rory Brooke MRTPI	Director, Savills
Ken Dijksman MRTPI	Senior Partner Dijksman Planning LLP

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Charles Merrett	Barrister, Francis Taylor Building
Ed Maddern	Planning Officer
Daniel Lord	Area Planning Enforcement Team Leader
Eoin Concannon	Planning Team Leader
Gavin Polkinghorn	Planning Policy Team Leader
Alan Tilly	Transport & Aviation Team Manager

Schedule of Conditions to be attached to Permission APP/R5510/C/26/3378454

- 1) Without prejudice to the other conditions attached to this permission, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below: 8190976/6100 – received 28 Jan 2025 005.01-Rev B – received 23 Jun 2025 8190976/6101.

Reason: To comply with the terms of the permission and for certainty.

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be for a limited period of three years from the date of this decision. At the end of this period the use hereby permitted shall cease, all buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought onto, or erected on the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use shall be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place.
- 3) Reason: To support a business in the short term and allow a mechanism of review of the effects of the development on the highway network
- 4) The site shall be used solely for the parking and storage of commercial vehicles and for no other purpose, including any separate storage, distribution, open storage, waste transfer, vehicle sales, plant hire, contractor's yard or other commercial use.

Reason: To safeguard the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt.

- 5) No more than 25 no. Heavy Goods Vehicles shall be stationed on the site at any one time.

Reason: To prevent an intensification of the use which would result in additional harm to the Green Belt and local amenity.

- 6) No containers, skips, building materials, machinery, equipment, pallets, waste materials, aggregates, plant or other items shall be stored outside any building on the site at any time.

Reason: To preserve the openness of the Green Belt.

- 7) No vehicle servicing, repair, spraying, dismantling, valeting, washing or maintenance operations shall take place on the site, other than for the 25 no. vehicles subject of this planning permission.

Reason: To protect the character of the area and amenities of nearby occupiers.

- 8) No vehicle movements into or out of the site shall take place on Sundays or Bank Holidays or except between 06:30 to 19:30 Mondays to Fridays and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby occupiers and the rural character of the area.

- 9) Details of wheel washing facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be installed within 1 month of approval and thereafter retained and used at all times to ensure that no mud or debris is deposited on the public highway.

Reason: To be in accordance with London Plan 2021 Policy T4.

- 10) Within 1 month of the date of this permission, an Operations Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to include details of routing, fleet management, driver management and day-to-day logistics operations, and to ensure that vehicles larger than a light goods vehicle do not access or egress via Newyears Green Lane to the west of the site. The development must always be operated in accordance with the approved Plan.

Reason: To accord with London Plan 2021 Policy T4 and Policy T7 Deliveries, servicing, and construction.

- 11) Within 1 month of the date of this permission, a Parking Design and Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include, as a minimum, details of disabled persons' parking, minibus parking, dropoff and pick-up arrangements, and the number and specification of electric vehicle charging points. The approved Plan shall be implemented within 1 month of approval and thereafter retained.

Reason: To accord with the London Plan 2021 Policy T6 Car parking and Policy T6.5 non-residential disabled persons parking.

- 12) Within 1 month of the date of this permission, a Green Travel Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Plan shall be implemented within 1 month of approval and thereafter retained.

Reason: To encourage sustainable methods of transport at the site.

- 13) The use hereby permitted shall cease and all structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed within 30 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:

- i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for:
 - a) the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site
 - b) proposed and existing external lighting on the boundary of and within the site;
 - c) improved visibility splays at the site access including removal of vegetation on highway land that obscures visibility splays, in accordance with Manual for Streets and its replacement with a suitable hard surface to prevent regrowth;
 - d) tree, hedge and shrub planting to be implemented during the first planting season following approval thereof, including details of species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities and provision for replacement of any trees or shrubs which die, are

removed or become seriously damaged within five years of planting and where appropriate earth mounding;
(hereafter referred to as the site development scheme) shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation.

- ii) If within 11 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
- iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
- iv) The approved scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be maintained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

Reason: To safeguard the openness and rural character of the Green Belt, mitigate the visual impact of the development, mitigate transport impacts London Plan 2021 Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts which requires that development proposals should “not increase road danger” and to ensure satisfactory drainage and minimise flood risk.